de Goyaz, Brasil, 86, 1911, 1-150.—Heikertinger, F. Zur praxis des kaferfanges mit dem katscher, 38, xxx, 227-233.—Kerremans, C. Remarques synonymiques sur quelques especes du genre Cyphogastra, 35, 1911, 294-297.—Kleine, R. Biologisches über den schwarzen Aaskafer (Phosphuga atrata), 193, vii, 193-199.-Lund, E. J. On the structure, physiology and use of photogenic organs, with special reference to the Lampyridae, 184, 1911, 415-468.—Mangan, J. The occurrence of Necrobia and Dermestes in cotton bales, 186, vi, 133-138.—Netolitsky, F. Die parameren und das system der Adephaga (Caraboides), 44, 1911, 221-239.—Norton, A. H. The potato beetle (Doryphora decemlineata) eating the eggs of its kind, 4, 1911, 385 .- Nusslin, O. Phylogenie und system der borkenkafer, 92, vii, 271-278 (cont.) .- Ohaus, F. Neue gattungen und arten der Dynastidengruppe Phileurini, 84, 1911, 169-171.-Rungius, H. Ueber die physiologische bedeutung des kaumagens von Dytiscus marginalis, 22, 1911, 442-446.—Santschi, F. Une nouvelle espece d'Eciton, 24, lvi, 113.-Strohmeyer, H. Die familie der Platypopiden und ihre einteilung, 193, vii, 217-218.-Wickham, H. F. A list of the Coleoptera of Iowa, 350, vi, No. 2, 1-40.

HYMENOPTERA.—Allard, H. A. Some experimental observations concerning the behavior of various bees in their visits to cotton blossoms. II, 3, 1911, 668-685.—Cockerell, T. D. A. Records of bees, 4, 1911, 389-391 (*). Descriptions and records of bees.—XXXIX, 11, viii, 660-673 (*).—Cushman, B. A. Notes on the peach and plum slug (Caliroa amygdalina), 7, Bull. No. 97, pt. V. -Girault, A. A. Miscellaneous notes on the Hymenoptera Chalcidoidea: The genera Arthrolytus, Horismenus, Microgaster, 4, 1911, 370-377 (*).—Hormuzaki, F. Die systematische und morphologische stellung der bukowiner foremen von Melitaea athalia, und aurelia, 92, vii, 261-267.—Schmidt, A. Neue Aphodiinen und eine synonymische bemerkung, 40, 1911, 55-56.—Schmiedeknecht, O. Opuscula Ichneumonologica. Fasc. XXIX, pp. 2241-2322.—Schulz, W. A. Grabwespen-Typen Tourniers, Brulles, Lepeletiers und Schencks, 40, xxvi, 57-59 (cont.).—Turner, R. E. Notes on fossorial Hymenoptera.-V., 11, viii, 602-624.-Wheeler, W. M. Pseudoscorpions in ant nests, 5, xviii, 166-168. Literature for 1910 on the behavior of ants, their guests and parasites, 324, 1911, 413-429.

OPHIONINAE.—A REVIEW.—In one of the latest fascicles of the Genera Insectorum, namely Fascicule 114me, received at the Smithsonian Institution, October 12, 1911, and containing 100 pages and 2 plates, Mr. Gy. V. Szepligeti treats of the group of Ophioninae which in his

opinion have a spindel shaped abdomen and for which he proposes to use Foerster's term Mesochoroidae.

Of the Ashmeadian groups Mr. Szepligeti treats the Plectiscini, (omitting the available genera Hambergiella Roman, Mischoxorides Ashmead, Clepticus Haliday, Symphylus Foerster, Acroblapticus Schmiedeknecht, Campothreptus Foerster, Zarhynchus Ashmead, Rhynchothyreus Ashmead, and Grypocentrus Ruthe); the Mesochorini, (omitting Thymaris Foerster, which he probably holds with others as belonging to the Tryphoninae and Edrisa Cameron); the Campoplegini excepting the genera with compressed abdomen, (omitting Phobocampa Thomson, Paurolexis Cameron, Enytus Cameron, Neobosmina Cameron, and Dusona Cameron); the Banchini, which he would place in the Pimplinae near Lissonotini, (omitting Agathilla Westwood and Nawaia Ashmead); the Paniscini, which he says belongs to the Tryphoninae, (omitting Bucheckerius Schulz and Paropheltes Cameron); the Hellwigiini (omitting Diamon Gistel); the Nesomesochorini which he persistently misspells as Neomeschorinae and which he holds belongs to the Tryphoninae, (in this view the writer cannot concur as the Nesomesochorus Ashmead is almost morphologically identical with Nonnus Cresson and should be placed near Zachresta Foerster according to present day classifications); and the Megacerinae a group not in Ashmead's classification and held by Szepligeti to belong to the Tryphoninae.

No attempt is made in the work under consideration to bring up to date the first part of the Ophioninae published by the same author, so the available genera omitted from that part are not accounted for—these genera are Odontagrypon Cameron in the Anomalini, Ophiononeura Cameron, Enicospilus Stephens and Genophion Felt in the Ophionini and Hiatensor Brues and Protohellwigia Brues of the Ophioninae.

The chief feature of this classification is the attempt to treat the Ophioninae with a more or less fusiform abdomen and usually round propodeal spiracles as a separate group from those having a compressed abdomen and with the propodeal spiracles usually elongate. In effect this is to apply Foerster's division of the Campoplegini to the whole Ophioninae. Inasmuch as these characters are of doubtful value as a means to a definite end even in the Campoplegini, and owing to the fact that there are numerous examples of intermediates between completely compressed abdomen and fusiformly compressed abdomen and between round and elongate propodeal spiracles, the reviewer is of the opinion that the present classification does not clear up the situation, but makes the classification more unsatisfactory than ever. Are not the difficulties attendant on separating Ichneumonidae into groups through the use of the depression or compression of the abdomen great enough without

again dividing the compressiventres into groups on the degree of compression! To pursue such a course it would seem is to bring on distraction.

In the "Limnerinae" the customary neglect of the Foerster collection is manifest and as usual no reason is given for this procedure. Granting that the Foerster collection of Campoplegini is still in existence our European colleagues could do a great service by consulting it and reconciling the species on which the genera without geno-types were based with the latest facts, to the end that Foerster's genera without species would have species placed in them. It is greatly to be regretted that this latest classification still leaves us in the dark with reference to the genera of Foerster without a species.

The zoogeographical arrangement of the species is convenient and helpful as in other parts done by Mr. Szepligeti. It were well if this arrangement were adhered to throughout the Genera Insectorum. For example the Chalcididae part would have been made useful had the species been divided into zoogeographical regions.

Some corrections and changes are called for-to wit:-page 11, Biolysa should read Biolysia; page 12, Canidia Holmgren is certainly preoccupied in the Coleoptera as correctly held by Ashmead; page 13, the genotype of Hyposoter is H. parorgyiae Viereck and of Horogenes the type is H. discoocellellae Viereck. Both of these genera may be distinguished from Casinaria by the shorter propodeum which hardly extends beyond the base of hind coxae and does certainly not surpass the basal third of the hind coxæ; there are other differences, but this we hold to be the most important-hence we are opposed to Horogenes and Hyposoter as being synonymous with Casinaria. As the genotypes of Horogenes and Hyposoter were not published until 1910 they probably were not known to Szepligeti before he finished his paper; page 15, the genotype of Limneria Holmgren cannot be a species congeneric with Eulimneria Schmiedeknecht so the reviewer in order to make as little confusion as possible chooses (Ichneumon) Limneria longipes (Muller) Gravenhorst. Thomson, as type of Limneria; the type chosen for Olesicampe Foerster is Ichneumon longipes Muller, thus Limneria and Olesicampe are isogenotypic and Olesicampe becomes the name to be used in place of the preoccupied Limneria, making Limnerium unnecessary. Eulimneria is not congeneric with Olesicampe and should not be placed as synonymous with the same: page 21, as the genotype of Phaedroctonus Foerster is not included, its being a synonym of Nemeritis Holmgren is questioned; page 30, Tranosema is preoccupied by the Tranosema (Foerster) Thomson, and therefore may be called Zatranosema new name; page 33, the synonymy being correct Eriborus must replace Anilastus; page 38, Nythobia and Diadegma

have had species placed to their credit; page 39, Anempheres had a species assigned to it early last year (1911), Idechthis is misspelled: page 40, Asinamora is misspelled; page 42, Campoletis had a species assigned to it early last year (1911), Ameloctonus had a species assigned to it by Ashmead in the 1900 edition of the New Jersey List of Insects; page 55, Aperileptus is misspelled; page 65, Aniseres pallipes is misspelled; page 68, the type of Helictes Haliday is the same as that of Myriarthrus Foerster, these genera are therefore synonymous, but not the same as Megastylus Schiodte, Helictes being the older genus replaces Myriarthrus Foerster; page 70, Nesomesochorini and Nesomesochorus are misspelled; Cidaphus Foerster and Plesiophthalmus Foerster are isogenotypic, therefore Cidaphus replaces Plesiophthalmus Foerster which is preoccupied, Ashmead's Plesiophthalmus is very likely not congeneric with Cidaphus Foerster; page 76, Parabates (Foerster) Szepligeti is preoccupied by Parabates (Foerster) Dalla Torre and should be replaced by Opheltoideus Ashmead; page 84, Ceratogastra is misspelled; page 85, Xenoschesis and Polycinetus are misspelled.

The author is to be congratulated upon having finished the Ophioninæ and it is to be hoped that in a supplementary part he will reconcile the Foerster collections in this subfamily at least with his work as it now stands.—H. L. VIERECK, U. S. National Museum, Washington, D. C.

DAS TIERREICH, 26 Lieferung-Ixodidae, 169 pp., 1911, by L. G. Neumann. Dr. Neumann's long-deferred part on the ticks has just been issued. It was prepared in 1907 and does not contain species published since the early part of 1908. Yet it will be of the greatest value to the systematist as a summary of the author's well-known "Revision de la famille des Ixodides," and the "Notes." The family is divided into two sub-families, Ixodinæ and Spelæorhynchidæ, the latter for a peculiar mite which is probably more related to Gamasidæ. The Ixodinæ is divided into two sections, Ixodini and Argatini, the latter the Argasidæ of many writers. The genera of Ixodini are arranged in three tribes; Ixodaria (the same as my Ixodini), the Rhipicephalaria (the same as my Rhipicephalini, plus the exotic genus Hyalomma), and the Amblyommataria, which includes Amblyomma, Haemaphysalis and Dermacentor. The author correctly places Boophilus as a synonym of Margaropus, and Rhipicentor as a Rhipicephalus, widely separated from Dermacentor. Aponomma is retained as a valid genus. Ceratizodes and Eschatocephalus are put as subgenera of Ixodes. Our chicken tick, A gas miniatus, is put as a sub-species of A. persicus. Altogether 207 species and 40 sub-species are held as valid. In the back is a useful host-list.—N. BANKS, East Falls Church, Virginia.